PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO VALIDATE THE GENERIC NAME " PHRYNOSOMA " WIEGMANN, 1828 (CLASS REPTILIA, ORDER SQUAMATA), A NAME PLACED ON THE " OFFICIAL LIST OF GENERIC NAMES IN ZOOLOGY " BY THE RULING GIVEN IN " OPINION " 92

By **HOBART M. SMITH**

(*Department of Zoology, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois, U.S.A.*)

(Commission Reference : Z.N.(S.) 399)

The purpose of the present application is to ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to use its Plenary Powers for the purpose of validating the generic name *Phrynosoma* Wiegmann, 1828 (Class Reptilia). This seems to me to be important for two reasons : First, this name was placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* thirty years ago by the Ruling given in the Commission's *Opinion* 92 (1926, *Smithson. misc. Coll.* **73** (No. 4) : 3–4). Second, there is associated with this generic name a considerable literature of an anatomical, histological and ecological nature as well as of a taxonomic character. The facts bearing on this case are set out below.

2. The nominal genus *Phrynosoma* Wiegmann, 1828 (*Isis* (Oken) 1828 : 367) was established with three included nominal species but with no designated or indicated type species. From these included species the first to be selected as the type species of this genus was *Lacerta orbicularis* Linnaeus, 1758 (*Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 206), that species having been so selected by Fitzinger in 1843 (*Syst. Rept.* : 17). At this point it will be convenient to deal with a question connected with the interpretation of the above nominal species which needs to be cleared out of the way before consideration is given to the senior synonyms of the generic name *Phrynosoma* Wiegmann. It must be noted that, when in 1758 Linnaeus established this nominal species, he supplemented the short Latin diagnosis provided by citing references to Seba (: pl. 83, figs. 1, 2) and to Hernandez. He gave the locality for this species as Mexico. To the species in the genus *Lacerta* standing immediately before *L. orbicularis*, Linnaeus then gave the name *Lacerta hispida* (: 205–206), for which he cited two references, the first, to his own work the *Museum Adolphi Friderici*, the second to Seba. In the case of Seba, Linnaeus cited two plates, first, Seba's pl. 109, fig. 6, second, Seba's pl. 83, figs. 1, 2. It will be seen therefore that already by this date Linnaeus' ideas about his species *Lacerta orbicularis* were confused, as the figures of Seba's on which he largely based that species were also cited by him as part of the basis for the preceding nominal species to which he then gave the name *Lacerta hispida*. This confusion was greatly increased by Linnaeus' treatment of the subject in 1766 (*Syst. Nat.* (ed. 12) **1**(1) : 365, 366). On this occasion Linnaeus suppressed all reference to *Lacerta hispida* as such and transferred to *Lacerta orbicularis* the bibliographical references which in 1758 he had cited under the name *Lacerta hispida*. He seems, however, to have recognised that this was not a very natural arrangement, for he divided *Lacerta orbicularis* into two " varieties " ; for the first, which he called var. α, he cited the references which in 1758 he had cited under the name *Lacerta hispida* ; for the second, which he called var. β, he cited the references which in 1758 he had cited for *L. orbicularis*, adding at the same time the reference " *Syst. nat.* 10. *p.* 206. *n.* 24 ", i.e. a reference to his own *L. orbicularis* of 1758. By the foregoing treatment Linnaeus in 1766 perpetuated the confusion into which he had fallen in 1758, by citing Seba's plate 83, figs. 1, 2, both under var. α and under var. β, the " varieties " into which he now divided the nominal species *Lacerta orbicularis*. For practical purposes this matter was put straight by Laurenti in 1768 (*Specimen med.* : 51), when he restricted Seba's pl. 83, figs. 1 and 2 to *Lacerta orbicularis* and that author's plate 109, fig. 6 to *Lacerta hispida*. This arrangement has been generally followed by later writers and corresponds with current practice. So far however no author has formally selected a lectotype for *Lacerta orbicularis* Linnaeus, 1758. It is clearly desirable that this should be done, in order to complete the foundation on which the current interpretation of that nominal species is based. Accordingly, I now select the specimen figured as figs. 1 and 2 on plate 83 in Volume 1 of the work by Seba published in 1734 under the title *Locupletissimi Rerum naturalium Thesauri accurati Descriptio* to be the lectotype of the nominal species *Lacerta orbicularis* Linnaeus, 1758. This selection has the further advantage of definitely fixing the type locality for this nominal species as " Mexico ", this being not only the locality given by Linnaeus in 1758 but also the locality of the specimen figured by Seba (which is derived from Hernandez, Libr. IX, c. 16).

3. We may now turn to examine the generic names which are senior synonyms of *Phrynosoma* Wiegmann and which it is now desired should be suppressed by the International Commission under its Plenary Powers. It should be noted that these names are variant spellings of one another, differing in spelling through the use of the letters " yi ", " y " and " j " as alternatives for the consonantal " i ". When in 1949 I first communicated with the Office of the Commission in regard to the present case there was a proposal awaiting consideration by the International Congress of Zoology that variant spellings of this type should be ignored for the purpose of determining whether any given pairs of generic names should be regarded as being homonyms of one another. This suggestion was negatived by the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology, Copenhagen, 1953, when it inserted in the *Règles* a provision that " a generic name is not to be treated as a homonym of another such name if it differs from it in spelling by even one letter " (1953, *Copenhagen Decisions zool. Nomencl.* : 78, Decision 152). So far therefore as this question is concerned, the ground has been cleared for the taking of a decision in the present case.

4. Before we examine in detail the names which require to be considered, we must note that all the authors who used these names must have derived them—either directly or indirectly—from Cuvier, all the names concerned being variants of the name *Tapaya*. In a few cases only, however, was Cuvier's name actually cited. In those cases where Cuvier was treated as the author, the name was attributed either to the Second Edition of the *Règne Animal* (page 37 not page 57 as often incorrectly stated) which was published in 1829 or to the First Edition (: 35) of that work published in 1817. The explanation is no doubt that in the *Règne Animal* Cuvier recognised a group to which he applied the vernacular (French) name " Les Tapayes " but to which he did not give a Latin name. The names with which we are concerned are in order of date as follows :—

(a) *Tapaja* Oken, 1816, *Lehrbuch Naturgesch.* 3 (Zool.) (2) : 295

(b) *Tapaia* Oken, 1816, *Lehrbuch Naturgesch.* 3 (Zool.) (2) : vi (Table of Contents)

(c) *Tapaia* Oken, 1817, *Isis* (Oken) **1817** : 1183

(d) *Tapaya* Oken, 1817, *Isis* (Oken) **1817** : 1183

(e) *Tapayia* Gray (J.E.), 1825, *Ann. Phil.* 26 : 197

(f) *Tapaya* Fitzinger, 1826, *Neue Class. Rept.* : 17

5. Both of the names published by Oken in 1816 in his *Lehrbuch*—*Tapaja* Oken, 1816, and *Tapaia* Oken, 1816—are invalid owing to the rejection by the Commission for nomenclatorial purposes of the work in which they were published (*Opinion* 417). The above names are no more than Original Spellings for a single generic name and, as no author has so far determined which is to be accepted as the Valid Original Spelling and which the Invalid Original Spelling, it will be convenient for purposes of record that this should now be done. As shown in paragraph 4 above, the spelling used by Oken in his main text was *Tapaja*, the spelling *Tapaia* appearing only in the table of contents. It seems reasonable therefore to conclude that in this work Oken considered *Tapaja* to be the correct spelling. Accordingly, I here select that spelling to be the Valid Original Spelling, thus making *Tapaia* Oken, 1816, an Invalid Original Spelling. Oken did not designate or indicate a type species for the genus *Tapaja* as introduced by himself in the *Lehrbuch*. It is desirable, however, for the purposes of synonymy that this genus should be provided with a type

species and I therefore select from his included species the nominal species *Lacerta orbicularis* Linnaeus, 1758, to be the type species of *Tapaja* Oken, 1816. This name would thus be the oldest available name for, and the valid name of, the genus currently known as *Phrynosoma* Wiegmann, if it were not for the fact that work in which it was published has been rejected by the Commission for nomenclatorial purposes.

6. The name *Tapaia* Oken, 1817, was published in a contrasting tabular comparison of Cuvier's (1817) classification with that adopted by Oken himself. Oken introduced this name in the column devoted to the " Oken System " for the taxon for which in the column showing Cuvier's classification the name given was *Tapaya*. Cuvier, however, as has been explained in paragraph 4 above, did not employ a Latin name for this group, using for it only the French term " Les Tapayes ". Accordingly, both of the above names are attributable to Oken as from his *Isis* paper of 1817. These names are therefore no more than Original Spellings for a single generic name. It is essential at this point to determine which of these spellings is the Valid Original Spelling and which an Invalid Original Spelling, for whichever is the Valid Original Spelling is an available name, unless disqualified under some other head, while under the Copenhagen Rules whichever is an Invalid Original Spelling possesses no status in nomenclature and does not preoccupy any later use of the spelling concerned. The foregoing question has not hitherto been considered in the literature and accordingly I now select the spelling *Tapaia* Oken, 1817, to be the Valid Original Spelling of this generic name, the spelling *Tapaya* thus becoming an Invalid Original spelling and consequently devoid of status in zoological nomenclature. This action appears to correspond with Oken's intention in his *Isis* paper, for the spelling *Tapaia* is the spelling then used by him in the column describing his own system, as contrasted with the spelling *Tapaya* which in that paper he used only when describing the system adopted by Cuvier.

7. The type species of *Tapaia* Oken, 1817, is *Lacerta orbicularis* Linnaeus, 1758, by monotypy. Accordingly, as the name *Tapaia* is not a junior homonym of any previously published generic name, it is an available name possessing rights under the Law of Priority. Further in view of its type species, it is a senior objective synonym of *Phrynosoma* Wiegmann, 1828, of which also (as shown in paragraph 2 above) *Lacerta orbicularis* Linnaeus is the type species. It is the object of this part of the present application to seek the validation of the name *Phrynosoma* Wiegmann by the suppression under the Plenary Powers of its senior synonym *Tapaia* Oken, 1817, a name which has never been used for the genus concerned. The name *Tapaia* Oken, 1817, so suppressed, should then be placed on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology*, together with the name *Tapaya* Oken, 1817, which, as an Invalid Original Spelling, is already objectively invalid.

8. The nominal genus *Tapayia* Gray, 1825, has as its type species by monotypy the nominal species *Lacerta orbicularis* Linnaeus, 1758. This name is therefore a junior objective synonym of *Tapaia* Oken, 1817, and also a senior objective synonym of *Phrynosoma* Wiegmann, 1828. Since it is the purpose of this application to secure the validation of the name *Phrynosoma* Wiegmann, it is recommended that the Commission should use its Plenary Powers to suppress the name *Tapayia* Gray as well as the name *Tapaia* Oken (the suppression of which has already been proposed in paragraph 7 above).

9. The nominal genus *Tapaya* Fitzinger, 1826, also has as its type species the nominal species *Lacerta orbicularis* Linnaeus, 1758, and is therefore a junior objective synonym both of *Tapaia* Oken, 1817, and of *Tapayia* Gray, 1825, and a senior objective synonym of *Phrynosoma* Wiegmann, 1828. This name is an available name, since the only earlier generic name consisting of the same word—*Tapaya* Oken, 1817—is an Invalid Original Spelling for another name (*Tapaia* Oken, 1817) and possesses no status in zoological nomenclature. Accordingly, in order to secure the validation of the name *Phrynosoma* Wiegmann, it will be necessary for the name *Tapaya* Fitzinger to be suppressed under the Plenary Powers, concurrently with the suppression under those Powers of the two names of earlier date specified in paragraph 8 above.

II. The problems associated with the generic name "Agama" Daudin, [1802]

10. The nominal species *Lacerta hispida* Linnaeus, 1758, which (as shown in Part I of the present application) was confused by Linnaeus with *Lacerta orbicularis* Linnaeus, 1758, both in 1758 and again in 1766 and was not clearly defined until in 1768 the confusion in this matter was dispelled by Laurenti, is currently regarded as representing a taxonomically valid species. Accordingly, under the "Completeness-of-Opinions" Rule, the specific name *hispida* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Lacerta hispida* and as interpreted by Laurenti (1768), should now be placed on the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology*.

11. The nominal species *Lacerta hispida* Linnaeus, 1758, is currently assigned on taxonomic grounds to the genus *Agama* Daudin, [1802] (*in* Sonnini's Buffon, *Rept.* **3** : 333). It is desirable that the present opportunity should be taken to place the generic name *Agama* Daudin on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* both because it is a name to some extent involved in the present case, and because it is an important genus currently accepted as the type genus of the family AGAMIDAE. Certain difficulties arise in connection with this name, both at the generic-name level and at the family-group-name level. The first of these problems is discussed in the present Part, the problems arising at the family-group-name level being dealt with later in Part III.

12. The genus *Agama* was established by Daudin for a number of nominal species, one of which was the new nominal species *Agama colonorum* Daudin, [1802] (3 : 336). In the synonymy of this species Daudin cited the older nominal species *Lacerta agama* Linnaeus, 1758 (*Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 207). Up to 1948 there was considerable doubt as to the method to be adopted for determining what species should be regarded as having been " originally included " species for any given genus. The meaning of the *Règles* in this regard was, however, clarified by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology at Paris in 1948 when it decided to insert in the *Règles* a provision that the nominal species to be regarded as having been included in a given nominal genus at the time when the name of that genus was first published are (i) the nominal species cited by the original author as valid taxonomic species belonging to that nominal genus and (ii) any nominal species, the names of which were cited on that occasion as synonyms of nominal species falling in (i) above (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 179–180, Decision 69(3)(a)). Under the foregoing provision the nominal species *Lacerta agama* Linnaeus, 1758, having been identified by Daudin with his nominal species *Agama colonorum* by the citation of the specific name *agama* Linnaeus in the synonymy of *colonorum* Daudin, ranks as one of the nominal species originally included in this genus. In view of the tautonymy between the Linnean name for this species and the generic name published by Daudin, the nominal species *Lacerta agama* Linnaeus 1758, is the type species of the genus *Agama* Daudin, [1802] by absolute tautonymy under Rule (d) in Article 30 and has been the type species of that genus ever since it was first established. The foregoing interpretation of Article 30 corresponds with the prior practice of specialists in this case, for already as far back as 1928 (*Abh. senckenb. naturforsch. Ges.* **41** : 25) Mertens & Muller had stated that " *colonorum* = *agama* " was the type species of this genus.

13. The species discussed above was for many years known by the specific name *colonorum* Daudin, but in 1900 (*Bihang. K. svenck. Vet.-Akad. Handl.*, Stockholm **26** (Section 4) (No. 1) : 11) Andersson showed that the material on which Daudin had based his nominal species *Agama colonorum* consisted predominantly of specimens of the species now identified with *Lacerta agama* Linnaeus, three out of the four specimens concerned being referable to that species, while the fourth was a specimen of the quite different species *Lacerta plica* Linnaeus, 1758. For many years after the publication of Andersson's paper the present species continued to be known by the name *colonorum* Daudin. In 1928, however, in his " Liste der Amphibien und Reptilien "

Mertens abandoned Daudin's name, applying to this species the specific name *agama* Linnaeus. In the following year Mertens was followed by Flower (1929, *List Vertebr. Anim.* **3** : 96) and—and this was even more important—by Loveridge (1929, *Bull. U.S. nat. Mus.* **151** : 48). From that time onwards the specific name *colonorum* Daudin seldom appeared in the literature, the species always being called by the name *agama* Linnaeus. Today this specific name is very well known, the species concerned being divided into countless subspecies.

14. At this point it is necessary to consider the question whether the specific name *colonorum* Daudin, [1802], as published in the combination *Agama colonorum*, should be regarded as a junior subjective synonym of *agama* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Lacerta agama*, or whether it should more properly be looked upon as a junior objective synonym of that name. From this point of view the name *colonorum* Daudin could be regarded as being (a) a direct substitute for (*nom. nov. pro*) the name *agama* Linnaeus cited by Daudin in the synonymy of his new species, or (b) a name proposed partly as a substitute for *agama* Linnaeus but in part also based on actual specimens, or (c) a name which was not intended to be a substitute for *agama* Linnaeus, being no more than the name of a carelessly constructed composite species based partly upon actual specimens and partly upon the description of the specimens on which Linnaeus had established his nominal species *Lacerta agama*. Of these possibilities the third may be immediately dismissed as being artificial and unrealistic. In my view there can be no doubt that Daudin regarded his nominal species as in part at least a substitute nominal species for that established by Linnaeus under the name *Lacerta agama*. Although according to modern ideas Daudin was in error in rejecting the name *Lacerta agama* Linnaeus, there can be little doubt that in so doing he was prompted by the dislike of absolute tautonymy between generic and specific names that was widely felt by zoologists of his day and that it was his decision to establish a new genus consisting of the word " Agama " which led him to replace the specific name *agama* Linnaeus by a new name (*colonorum*). Daudin said nothing to imply that he was describing his species *Agama colonorum* at least in part upon actual specimens though the investigations by Andersson (1900) referred to in paragraph 13 above suggest that this was the case. However, from a nomenclatorial point of view it makes no difference whether the specific name *colonorum* Daudin was established wholly, or only partly, as a substitute for *agama* Linnaeus, for in either case the two names are objective synonyms of one another, the nominal species concerned having the same specimen as type specimen. It should perhaps be recalled by way of explanation that the rule set out above in relation to taxa belonging to the species-name group was adopted in 1953 by the Copenhagen Congress (1953, *Copenhagen Decisions zool. Nomencl.* : 75–76, Decision 142).

15. In the light of the particulars given above, we may complete as follows the recommendation submitted in paragraph 11 above that the name *Agama*

Daudin, [1802], should be placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*. First, it should be noted that this name is feminine in gender. Second, the type species of this genus should be recorded as being *Lacerta agama* Linnaeus, 1758, by absolute tautonymy.

16. The other action which requires to be taken in this connection is the addition to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* of the name *agama* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Lacerta agama*, with an endorsement that this is the specific name of the type species of *Agama* Daudin, [1802], and the addition to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* of the specific name *colonorum* Daudin, [1802], as published in the combination *Agama colonorum*, with an endorsement that it is a junior objective synonym of *agama* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Lacerta agama*.

III. Family-Group-Name Problems

17. No family-group-name problem arises in connection with the first of the generic names dealt with in the present application, *Phrynosoma* Wiegmann, 1828, that generic name not having been taken as the base for a name in the family-group category. The genus so named is currently placed in the family IGUANIDAE.

18. The generic name *Agama* Daudin, [1802], the second of the names with which we are concerned, has, however, been taken as the base for a family-group name, the genus so named being currently placed in the family AGAMIDAE. That family-group name should now be placed on the *Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology*. There are, however, certain difficulties in connection with this family-group name which must first be considered. These difficulties are discussed below.

19. It was stated by Boulenger (1885, *Cat. Lizards Brit. Mus.* **1** : 250) that the nominal family AGAMIDAE was first established by Gray (J.E.) in 1827 (*Phil. Mag.* (2) **2** : 57) and this statement has been widely copied by later authors. However, this statement is correct only in so far as it refers to the first publication of a family-group name correctly formed with the termination " -IDAE ". Gray was not the first author to establish a nominal family-group taxon based on the genus *Agama* Daudin, [1802], for one year earlier such a taxon had been established by Fitzinger (1826, *Neue Class. Rept.* : 11, 17) under the name AGAMOIDEA. This family-group name should therefore be cited as AGAMIDAE (correction of AGAMOIDEA) Fitzinger, 1826.

20. The next point which we have to note is that in the same work as that in which Fitzinger established his nominal family-group taxon AGAMOIDEA, he established also two other nominal family-group taxa, both of which represent the same taxon as that currently known by the name AGAMIDAE. The names concerned, both of which have page precedence over the name AGAMOIDEA, are: (a) PNEUSTOIDEA (*Neue Class Rept.* : 11, 15); (b) DRACONOIDEA (*ibid.* : 11, 16). Fitzinger's PNEUSTOIDEA contained three genera, of which two (*Lyriocephalus*; *Phrynocephalus*) are currently recognised as belonging to the family AGAMIDAE, while the third (*Pneustes* Merrem, 1820) has never been satisfactorily identified. Fitzinger's DRACONOIDEA is based upon the genus *Draco* Linnaeus, 1758, which is a valid genus currently placed in the family AGAMIDAE. Since the Copenhagen Congress the relative precedence to be given to generic and specific names published in the same book and on the same date is determinable in accordance with the First Reviser Principle and not by page precedence (1953, *Copenhagen Decisions zool. Nomencl.* : 66–67, Decision 123). No express provision on this subject has as yet been made in relation to family-group names, but it is reasonable that a similar procedure should be followed in regard to this class of name. Indeed, a proposal in this sense is at present before the International Commission (Hemming, 1956, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **12** : 264–266). In the circumstances the proper course appears to be to proceed on the assumption that the relative precedence to be accorded to family-group names published on the same date and in the same work is subject to the same rule as that already laid down in relation to generic and specific names. This question has not hitherto been considered in the literature in relation to the particular names discussed above. Accordingly, in order to secure the position of the family-group name AGAMIDAE (correction of AGAMOIDEA) Fitzinger, 1826, from the above point of view, I now, as First Reviser choose the family-group name AGAMOIDEA Fitzinger, 1826, to be a name to have precedence over the following names published in the same book and on the same date, namely the names PNEUSTOIDEA Fitzinger and DRACONOIDEA Fitzinger.

21. The next point which requires to be considered is the status of the name AGAMIDAE (correction of AGAMOIDEA) Fitzinger, in relation to the older family group name STELLIONIDAE Bell, 1825 (*Zool. J.* **1** : 457). This name was clearly marked by Bell as a new name by the insertion of the word " Mihi " immediately after it. In other respects, however, it was introduced in a very unsatisfactory manner, for Bell did not give any diagnosis for his new family-group taxon and did not even specify its type genus, doing no more than place in it the genus *Uromastyx* Merrem. It was, however, common knowledge to Bell's contemporaries—just as it is perfectly well known to modern specialists—that Bell's intention in publishing the family-group name STELLIONIDAE, was to establish a nominal family-group taxon having as its type genus the nominal genus *Stellio* Daudin, [1802] (*in* Sinnini's Buffon, *Rept.* **4** : 5). Gray (J.E.) later in the same year (1825, *Ann. Phil.* (2) **10** : 196) took the view that the way in which this family-group name had been published by Bell was so unsatisfactory that it did not suffice to secure the status of availability for the name

STELLIONIDAE as so published. He accordingly republished this family-group name as a new name of his own, specifying *Stellio* Daudin as the type genus. In this matter subsequent authors have followed Gray and have attributed this family-group name to him and not to Bell. The minimum requirements which must be met for a family-group name to acquire availability have recently been clarified by the International Commission in *Declaration* 31 which provides that such a name is not to be rejected on the ground that the author publishing that name did not specify the name of its type genus. In these circumstances and having regard to the fact that the Copenhagen Congress had already prescribed that it is not necessary—though it is desirable—that an author establishing a nominal family-group taxon should provide an " indication " for that taxon in addition to incorporating in its name the stem of the stem of the name of its type genus, it is clear that Gray was in error in rejecting the name STELLIONIDAE Bell, 1825, on the ground that it had been published without an " indication ".

22. During much of the XIXth century the name *Stellio* Daudin, [1802], was treated as a nomenclatorially available name but was regarded as a junior synonym of *Agama* Daudin, [1802]. About twenty-five years ago Stejneger and Malcolm Smith pointed out that the name *Stellio* had been validly published by another author many years before it was published by Daudin, having been introduced in 1768 by Laurenti (*Specimen med.* : 56). Following this discovery Stejneger fearing that in consequence the name *Stellio* as from Laurenti might be re-introduced into the literature deliberately selected as the type species of this genus the unidentifiable species *Stellio saxatilis* Laurenti, 1768 (*op. cit.* : 57) (Stejneger, 1932, *J. Bombay nat. Hist. Soc.* **35** : 618). In 1936 Stejneger returned to this subject (*Copeia* 1936 : 138), observing that the type selection which he had made for *Stellio* Laurenti was " calculated to prevent the specter of *Stellio* becoming active again in herpetological literature ". Stejneger's was undoubtedly the first—and therefore the valid—type selection for the genus *Stellio* Laurenti, 1768. By reason of that selection that generic name became a *nomen dubium* and could in no circumstances represent a threat to the generic name *Agama* Daudin, [1802].

23. While the re-appearance of the generic name *Stellio* Laurenti, 1768, has fortunately no bearing on the present case at the generic-name level, it imports a valuable new element into it at the family-group-name level. For as we now see, the generic name *Stellio* Daudin, [1802], which is the name of the type genus both of STELLIONIDAE Bell, 1825, and of the independently established STELLIONIDAE Gray, 1825, is invalid as being a junior homonym of *Stellio* Laurenti, 1768. Under a decision by the Copenhagen Congress (1953, *Copenhagen Decisions zool. Nomencl.* : 36, Decision 54(1)(b)) a family-group name based upon the name of a type genus which is invalid as a junior homonym of another generic name is itself to be rejected as invalid. Accordingly, the family-group name STELLIONIDAE as published by Bell in 1825 and the same name as published later in the same year by Gray are both invalid. Thus all

threat from these names to the well-established name AGAMIDAE is removed. These invalid names should now be placed on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology* at the same time that the name AGAMIDAE (correction of AGAMOIDEA) Fitzinger, 1826 is placed on the *Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology.*

IV. Recommendations

24. In the light of the considerations set out in the present application the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is asked :—

(1) to use its Plenary Powers to suppress the under-mentioned generic names for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy :—

(a) *Tapaia* Oken, 1817 ;

(b) *Tapayia* Gray (J.E.), 1825 ;

(c) *Tapaya* Fitzinger, 1826 ;

(2) to confirm the generic name *Phrynosoma* Wiegmann, 1828, as validated under the Plenary Powers in (1) above, in its position on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, at the same time substituting the following entry on that *List* for that made thereon by the Ruling given in *Opinion* 92 :—

Phrynosoma Wiegmann, 1828, as validated under the Plenary Powers in (1) above (gender : neuter) (type species, by selection by Fitzinger (1843) : *Lacerta orbicularis* Linnaeus, 1758, as interpreted by the lectotype selected by Smith (H.M.) in paragraph 2 of the present application).

(3) to place the under-mentioned generic name on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* :—

Agama Daudin, [1802] (gender : feminine) (type species, by absolute tautonymy under Rule (d) in Article 30 : *Lacerta agama* Linnaeus, 1758) ;

(4) to place the under-mentioned specific names on the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* :—

(a) *orbicularis* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Lacerta orbicularis* and as interpreted by the lectotype specified in (2) above (specific name of type species of *Phrynosoma* Wiegmann, 1828) ;

(b) *hispida* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Lacerta hispida* and as interpreted by Laurenti (J.N.) (1768), acting as First Reviser ;

(c) *agama* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Lacerta agama* (specific name of type species of *Agama* Daudin, [1802]) ;

(5) to place the under-mentioned generic names on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* :—

(a) *Tapaja* Oken, 1816, a spelling selected from two Original Spellings to be the Valid Original Spelling in paragraph 5 of the present application (invalid because published in a work rejected for nomenclatorial purposes by the Ruling given in *Opinion* 417) ;

(b) *Tapaia* Oken, 1817 (a spelling selected from two Original Spellings to be the Valid Original Spelling in paragraph 6 of the present application (as suppressed under the Plenary Powers in (1)(a) above) ;

(c) *Tapaia* Oken, 1816 (an Invalid Original Spelling for *Tapaja* Oken, 1816, by selection in paragraph 5 of the present application ; invalid also because published in a work rejected for nomenclatorial purposes by the Ruling given in *Opinion* 417) ;

(d) *Tapaya* Oken, 1817 (an Invalid Original Spelling for *Tapaia* Oken, 1817, by selection in paragraph 6 of the present application) ;

(e) *Tapayia* Gray (J.E.), 1825, as suppressed under the Plenary Powers in (1)(b) above ;

(f) *Tapaya* Fitzinger, 1826, as suppressed under the Plenary Powers in (1)(c) above ;

(g) *Stellio* Daudin, [1802] (a junior homonym of *Stellio* Laurenti, 1768) ;

(6) to place the under-mentioned specific name on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* :—

colonorum Daudin, [1802], as published in the combination *Agama colonorum* (a junior objective synonym of *agama* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Lacerta agama*) ;

(7) to place the under-mentioned family-group name on the *Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology* :—

AGAMIDAE (correction of AGAMOIDEA) Fitzinger, 1826, a name having precedence over the family-group names PNEUSTOIDEA Fitzinger, 1826, and DRACONOIDEA Fitzinger, 1826, published in the same work and on the same date, through the First Reviser selection made by Smith (H.M.) in paragraph 20 of the present application (type genus: *Agama* Daudin, [1802]);

(8) to place the under-mentioned family-group names on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology* :—

(a) AGAMOIDEA Fitzinger, 1826 (an Invalid Original Spelling for AGAMIDAE);

(b) the under-mentioned family-group names, each of which is invalid because the name of its type genus (*Stellio* Daudin, [1802]) is a junior homonym of a generic name of older date (*Stellio* Laurenti, 1768) :—

- (i) STELLIONIDAE Bell, 1825;
- (ii) STELLIONIDAE Gray (J.E.), 1825.

SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSAL REGARDING THE GENERIC NAME "MANSONIA" BLANCHARD, 1901 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER DIPTERA)

By **HARRY D. PRATT**
(*Department of Health & Welfare, Atlanta, Georgia, U.S.A.*)

(Commission Reference : Z.N.(S.) 1193)

(For the proposals in this case see *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **13** : 160–166)

(Letter dated 24th July 1957)

I have noticed a Nomenclature Notice in *Entomological News* regarding the generic name *Mansonia*. I have published two papers on this genus ("Notes on American Mansonia Mosquitoes" *Proc. ent. Soc. Wash.* 55(1) : 9–19; "*Mansonia indubitans* Dyar and Shannan—a new Mosquito addition to the United States Fauna" *J. Kans. ent. Soc.* 18(4) : 121–129). I sincerely hope that this generic name can be used instead of *Taeniorhynchus* which I believe is more correctly used as a sub-generic name in the genus *Aedes*.

Dr. Stone has ably summed up the arguments in favour of *Mansonia* in John Lane's (1953) *Neotropical Culicidae*, 2 : 590. I feel certain that most mosquito taxonomists in the United States would prefer to have the generic name *Mansonia* placed on the *Official List* instead of *Taeniorhynchus*.